DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 196 HE 006 089

TITLE A Report to the Legislature on Women in Athletic Programs at the University of California.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 65p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Programs; *Athletics; *College Students; Equal Education; *Females; *Higher Education; Intramural Athletic Programs; Recreational Activities; Sex Discrimination; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of California

ABSTRACT

This document presents a summary report on the status of University of California athletic programs and on progress made in expanding opportunities for women. Each of five areas of campus athletic programs is reviewed in some detail for each sex, including: intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports, recreational club sports, physical education activities courses, and general recreation. Information is provided on every participating campus, and general conclusions on systemwide progress are presented. (MJM)

ED 100195

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON WOMEN IN ATHLETIC PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 089

Summary Edition 2 April, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

Scope of the Report
Program Definitions

SECTION TWO

Summary Report on the Status of University Athletic Programs and on Progress Made in Expanding Opportunities for Women

Section Three, which consists of detailed reports on athletic programs from the eight general campuses of the University of California, is not included in this edition due to its tremendous length and consequent printing costs. Copies of the full report, however, are available in the Office of the Vice President--University Relations in Berkeley and in the Chancellor's Office on each campus.

SECTION ONE

Athletic programs on the eight general campuses of the University of California vary widely in content, participation, and level of support. Many factors account for these differences, including the relative size of the campus, its participation in specific athletic conferences, its location, facilities, and the nature of the student body. Generally speaking, however, campus athletic programs include some form of:

1. intercollegiate athletics
2. intramural sports
3. recreational club sports
4. physical education activities courses
5. general recreation.

On the following pages, each of these areas is reviewed in some detail for each sex. Information is provided for every program on every participating campus. (San Francisco has no organized program.) Where possible, we have attempted to draw general conclusions on system-wide progress in a given area and to call your attention to emerging trends, for the sheer bulk of the information in this report would otherwise be overwhelming. The great variations among these programs, however, may often make the drawing of such conclusions impossible.

In this report we have detailed the expenditure of monies, regardless of source, which are utilized for the support of athletic programs. Information on University Registration Fees, gate receipts, television rights, alumni and booster club donations, Associated Students contributions, and State funds has been included.

In order to convey an accurate impression of the status of women's and men's athletics, we have also included comprehensive information on the policies governing athletic programs; and comparative data, by sex, on number of teams and participants, recruiting, financial assistance, and training services. In addition, historical narrative has been added when available.

It is important to note that, due to organizational variations, the athletic budgets contained herein are not always comparable. On the two largest campuses, for example, the intercollegiate athletic programs for men and women are separate, and the expenditure of funds can therefore be easily identified as to use by sex. Budgetary figures in reports from these campuses, then, show total dollars expended for each sex. At most campuses, however, the intercollegiate programs are combined within one department--and one budget. Certain expenditures within these budgets, particularly team expenses, can be identified as to use by sex; others cannot. Thus, while all expenditures are carefully outlined in the reports from these campuses, only team expenses, such as travel, supplies, and equipment, are categorized by sex.

Expenses in recreation and intramural programs are also difficult to compare. On some campuses, intramural programs are coordinated by full-time Intramural Directors through a separate Intramural Office. Intramural expenditures on these campuses will therefore show complete salary costs. On other campuses, intramural activities are sponsored through a general recreation office as one part of a comprehensive recreation program. In these cases, intramural salary costs are often impossible to delineate and thus appear within the general recreation budget.

In view of these and other variations, comparisons between different campuses are not valid.

Program Definitions

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

For the purposes of this report, intercollegiate athletic programs are defined as those athletic teams, including the training, coaching, administrative, and other activities related thereto, which are oriented toward organized competition with other collegiate institutions, normally but not exclusively through membership in one or more athletic conferences. As with other types of athletic activities, these programs vary widely from campus to campus. The two largest campuses, for example, are members of the Pacific-Eight Conference, conduct recruiting efforts, and award grants-in-aid to large numbers of student athletes. The Santa Cruz and San Diego campus programs, on the other hand, are simple and comparatively small. Neither gives athletic grants of any kind nor recruits student-athletes.

RECREATIONAL CLUB SPORTS

Club sports are ordinarily loosely-organized groups of students with similar sports interests. In some cases, students form a club solely for the purpose of pursuing some athletic activity with people of like interests. This type of club is often called a "recreational" or "social" club. In other instances, the club is organized specifically for competitive purposes, and meets may be scheduled with other collegiate institutions, community groups and private sports clubs, or other athletic organizations.

All clubs are student-initiated, student-supported, and student-governed. While most have a faculty or staff advisor, membership and other policy decisions are made by students.

INTRAMURAL SPORTS

Intramural sports programs are those activities which involve competition among teams sponsored by the same institution. These teams are ordinarily composed solely of students, but some campuses also provide for the participation of faculty, staff, and, in one case, local residents. Non-students normally pay a special participant fee. An exception to the inner-campus competition rule is the so-called "All-Cal" tournament, which is sponsored on a regular basis in order to provide competition among top-level intramural teams from all University campuses.

University of California campuses have imaginative, highly developed intramural sports programs. Due to strong support from students and a high degree of participation, these programs are frequently used as models for other colleges and universities. A broad variety of sports is offered, including such intriguing endeavors as icerink broomball, inner-tube water polo, and renaissance-type jousting. It is generally safe to say that no area of student interest is left untouched for long by the various intramural programs.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES COURSES

A wide variety of physical activities courses is offered on most University of California campuses. These classes are designed to teach students basic sports skills and to provide needed exercise. They are taught by Physical Education instructors and carry one-half unit credit on most campuses. Classes make use of indoor and outdoor facilities.

GENERAL RECREATION

General recreation programs are offered on all University campuses to meet the interests of students not included in intramural or extramural competitive sports programs. These programs normally include open recreational activities and recreation classes. Open recreational activities are those in which athletic facilities are available and supervised for all registered students. These are never restricted by sex and depend only upon the interest of students for participation. All activities are broadly publicized throughout the campus. Recreation classes are instructional programs open to all members of the University community. These include courses in horseback riding, sailing, back-packing, pottery, and many other leisure activities. Recreation classes are usually self-supporting.

SECTION TWO

The University of California has maintained organized athletic programs for men and women for over one hundred years. These programs, both intramural and extramural, have involved large numbers of students each year--many as participants, and many more as spectators. Athletic activities have had strong support, over the years, from the campus community and from the local citizenry.

Like virtually all athletic programs across the country, University of California athletic programs have been historically oriented primarily toward the male competitor. As is evident in the following status report, this situation is changing. More and more women are becoming involved in university athletic programs each year; financial support for women athletes is growing; and services offered to student-athletes are being stripped of any discriminatory aspects.

The greatest upsurge of participation by women has occurred in non-competitive athletic activities. Each year, increasing numbers of women enroll in physical activities courses and recreational sports clubs. In fact, the number of women enrollees in the former area currently exceeds the number of males.

Competitive sports have also witnessed an increase in the participation of women--but to a lesser extent than non-competitive sports. Intramural competition currently involves large numbers of women, and competitive sports clubs are moving in this direction. For various reasons, many of which

are inextricably enmeshed in societal traditions, the participation of women in intercollegiate athletics has grown at a slower rate. This year, however, appears to be the turning point for women's intercollegiate programs. Women's conference rules have been revised, campus budgets for women have been increased, committees have been appointed to plan for the future of women's athletics--and, above all, more women have turned out to participate in women's sports.

Following is a summary of the status reports for each campus which comprise Section Three of this report. Information is included on the policies governing University athletic programs, current and past opportunities, student participation, financing, staffing, support services, and use of facilities, as they affect each sex. An effort has been made to analyze campus information and to identify general trends. All statements of a general nature are, however, limited in worth due to the wide variations in program content and method of budgeting among the several campuses. The reader is therefore referred to Section Three for complete information.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The 100-year history of intercollegiate athletics for men and women can best be described, at this point, as separate--and clearly unequal. Men's programs have consistently received the bulk of available monies. Public attention, through newspapers, magazines, radio, and television has focused continuously on men's programs. Alumni, booster, and individual donations have almost without exception been earmarked for men's programs. Even student contributions from University Registration and Associated Students Fees, in the past, have gone almost solely for the support of men's programs.

This situation is changing. Recently, the growth of the women's movement and the emergence of nationally prominent women athletes have focused national attention on women's sports. Perhaps the most obvious benefit of this increased visibility is in the funding of women's athletic programs. Teams that formerly had no choice but to try to function, literally, on a shoe-string are receiving more money each year. Women's intercollegiate athletic funds on the Berkeley campus, for example, increased from $5,000 in 1972-73 to $42,500 in 1973-74. $100,000 is being requested for 1974-75. The Los Angeles campus increased its women's budget from $47,701 to $61,700 over the same period of time. Available information indicates that both the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses rank among the top ten universities across the country in financial support of women's intercollegiate athletic programs. At other University campuses progress is also evident. In 1972-73, women's

teams at the Santa Barbara campus received $5,000. Their resources tripled to $15,000 the following year. San Diego doubled its women's budget between 1971 and 1973 from $1,300 to over $2,600. Throughout the system, athletic budgets, while still far from parity, are beginning to reflect a new emphasis on women's sports.

Although these funding inequities are being corrected, the separation between men's and women's athletics has remained. And most athletes, both men and women, seem to want it that way. Their theory, briefly, is that official integration of existing teams by sex will continue to result in disadvantages for women because women's skills in most sports are, for various reasons, simply not currently equal to men's. Thus, opening men's teams to women on a competitive basis would not result in increased opportunity for women. And the reverse could be devastating: opening women's teams to men on a competitive basis could well result in their becoming all-male teams. Hardly an improvement for women, in either case.

Most women seem to agree that, at least for the present, separate men's and women's teams should be maintained in every sport in which students of both sexes demonstrate a significant interest and where skill levels for both sexes differ markedly. Where skill levels are not perceptibly different, as, for example, in badminton and cycling, fully coeducational teams are advocated. Most campuses presently adhere to this general policy in their athletic programs, but provision is ordinarily made within the structure for exceptional athletes. Thus, women athletes who need and desire the extra challenge offered by male competititon may well participate on a men's team,

even though an equivalent women's team is also offered. Flexibility appears to be all-important if the individual athlete is to have the kind of competitive experience that serves her or him best.

Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

Organized women's sports at the University of California began in 1878 on the Berkeley campus. The major sport for women athletes at that time was basketball, although women's "play days" occasionally included competition in other sports. During the following twenty years, women's sports experienced a gradual expansion. A fierce athletic rivalry between the Berkeley campus and nearby Stanford University was spawned during this time and formed the nucleus of women's intercollegiate competition in California for many years to come.

As other University campuses were established throughout the State, women's sports programs gradually took shape in other locations. Most campuses adopted some form of the Berkeley athletics model, where women's sports were sponsored through the Associated Women Students organization on each campus and administered by the student officers thereof.

The lengthy history of student governance of women's athletic programs has resulted in programs which, aside from obvious funding disparities, are far different from men's athletic programs. In the latter, policy decisions rest explicitly with the athletic director and his respective coaches.

In women's programs, on the other hand, the emphasis is generally on participation of the largest number of athletes and on the educational and recreational aspects of sports. Decisions on such matters as scheduling and players are often made by the team as a whole, rather than by the coach.

Women athletes are understandably reluctant to give up their participation in athletic policy-making to increased professionalization. They do, however, see a need for equitable funding of women's programs--including funding for more coaches and women administrators. The questions currently being debated by women athletes and coaches are "How Much?", "How far do we really want to go?", "Do we want to give grants other than those based upon need?", "Do we want to cultivate booster clubs?", "Do we want to charge admission?", "Do we want, in essence, to emulate the men's programs?".

Some women athletes respond to these questions by advocating equal funding, equal grants, and equal programs in every respect. Others would like to see women's programs remain essentially as they are. The bulk of women athletes, however, fall somewhere in between--wanting increased funding, but highly reticent about adopting many of the characteristics of men's programs which follow, to a large degree, from greatly increased funding. Judging from the intensity of the controversy, many of the points at issue will not be resolved for some time.

While female athletes are determining the future directions of their programs, it is important that they be allowed as much flexibility as possible. The campuses have generally recognized this need and are trying to avoid pressuring the women one way or another.

A. POLICY GOVERNANCE

Intercollegiate athletic programs are shaped by the policies of national and regional athletic conferences, as well as by University-wide policies and campus regulations. Following is a summary of those policies and regulations which pertain to the sex of intercollegiate participants;

a. National Organizations

With the exception of Santa Cruz, all general campuses of the University are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The San Diego campus also belongs to the National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

Until recently, the NCAA constitution contained specifications on the sex of participants in NCAA events. All language to that effect has now been removed, and women are allowed to compete in all NCAA events.

The AIAW, on the other hand, was designed specifically to "foster broad programs of women's intercollegiate athletics" and has continued to restrict its activities to women.

The NAIA has resolved to strike all language on the sex of its participants from its constitution, but the resolution cannot take effect until 1975 due to procedural requirements. In the meantime, however, the organization is ignoring its official rules and allows women to participate in all events.

b. Regional Conferences

Women's teams on university campuses located in the northern part part of the State participate in the Northern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (NCIAC); women's teams on southern campuses participate in the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SCWIAC). Both organizations are affiliated with the AIAW, and were established to "promote and coordinate women's and coeducational intercollegiate athletic policies and procedures for... membership." Competition in women's sports within these conferences is normally restricted to women. Coeducational sports sponsored by the SCWIAC and NCIAC are obviously open to both sexes.

University campuses also belong to a total of four athletic conferences which were traditionally oriented toward male competition. These include: the Pacific Eight Conference (Berkeley and Los Angeles), the Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Santa Barbara), the California College Athletic Association (Riverside), and the Far Western Conference (Davis). The policies of these Conferences no longer contain any reference to sex.

In addition, the Santa Cruz campus belongs to the California Coast Conference (CCC), a loosely structured organization designed to facilitate extramural competition. The CCC has no written policies and does not restrict participation by sex.

c. University Policies

University policy on sex discrimination reads as follows:

> "The University is committed to a policy against discriminatory practices based upon race, religion, national origin, or sex. All groups operating under The Regents, including administration, faculty, student governments, University-owned residence halls, and programs sponsored by the University, are governed by this policy of non-discrimination."

This statement is included in "University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students", which is made available to all students.

d. Campus Regulations

1. Participation

Policies on intercollegiate athletics vary from campus to campus. Generally speaking, however, these policies--which are usually unwritten--encourage the participation of men on men's teams and women on women's teams when comparable teams exist. "Men's" teams are, however, always open to women. In a growing number of cases, in fact, exceptional female athletes are encouraged to join "men's" teams--even when comparable teams for women exist. This is not true of women's teams which are ordinarily restricted to female students.

2. Addition of New Sports

The campuses generally have a policy of adding new sports upon "demonstration of significant student interest". The only variables in this decision are availability of facilities and financial resources.

Often, the campuses may require that a group of interested students form a sports club for the first year of competition. Then, if interest continues, full intercollegiate status may be awarded.

In an effort to develop women's intercollegiate programs, however, some campuses have made exceptions to the above guidelines. Several have temporarily declared a moritorium on new male sports. Others have dropped the one-year club requirement for women's teams in order to encourage their development.

3. Student Advice

Most campuses have established formal committees for obtaining student advice on athletic programs. The committees normally advise on planning, policy, and budgeting. On every campus but one, these groups include women students.

B. CURRENT OPPORTUNITIES

Teams

During the past year, much progress has been made on the University's general campuses in expanding opportunities for intercollegiate athletic participation by women. As is evident in the table below, opportunities for men remained relatively static between 1972-73 and 1973-74. In fact, only one sport was added for men in the entire system (San Diego campus), raising the men's system-wide total from ninety-eight to ninety-nine. Opportunities for women, on the other hand, were significantly increased. In 1972-73, the eight general campuses offered a total of forty-one sports for women. In 1973-74, thirteen sports were added for a system-wide total of fifty-four.

Table A

SPORTS

	1972-73			1973-74		
	Men's	Women's	Coed	Men's	Women's	Coed
Berkeley	15	6	0	15	9	1
Davis	11	7	1	11	9	1
Irvine*	10	2	0	10	2	0
Los Angeles	17	10	2	17	15	2
Riverside	11	4	1	11	4	1
San Diego**	17	5	2	18	7	3
Santa Barbara	12	5	0	12	5	0
Santa Cruz***	5	2	8	5	3	8

*The women's program combines intercollegiate and sports club characteristics.
**Combination of intercollegiate and sports club program.
***Competitive sports clubs (extramural).

Participants

In 1972-73, approximately 4,062 students or five percent of the University's total undergraduate student body, participated in intercollegiate athletics. In 1973-74, that number will increase to 4,564. As is evident in the table below, the bulk of the increase is in women's athletics. Total participation of women in intercollegiate sports jumped from 789 in 1972-73 to 1,054 in 1973-74--a 33.6% increase. Total participation of men during this period increased only 7.2%, from 3,273 to 3,510 system-wide.

The data below provides evidence of the efforts made by each campus to increase the participation of women. These efforts were clearly worthwhile, for every campus was able to increase the participation of women in 1973-74--two by over 50%. On only one campus does the percentage increase for male participants in 1973-74 exceed that for females. On most campuses, the women's increase far exceeds the increase in participation of men.

Table B

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS PARTICIPANTS

	1972-73	1973-74	Percent Change
Berkeley			
Women	125	175	40% increase
Men	700	700	0
Davis			
Women	157	250	59.2% increase
Men	422	479	11.8% increase
Irvine			
Women	23	30	30% increase
Men	184	200	8.6% increase
Los Angeles			
Women	209	250	19.6% increase
Men	691	691	0
Riverside			
Women	77	85	10.3% increase
Men	280	288	2.8% increase
San Diego			
Women	75	115	53.3% increase
Men	548	595	8.5% increase
Santa Barbara			
Women	123	149	21.1% increase
Men	448	557	24.3% increase

Although most of the progress during the past year has been focussed upon increasing the number of female participants in women's and coeducational intercollegiate activities, some progress has also been made in the involvement of women on traditionally all-male teams. While the numbers thus far are not overwhelming, the campuses are making strenuous efforts--particularly in swimming, crew, golf, tennis, and volleyball--to interest women in NCAA competition. The Los Angeles campus has had the most success to date, with a total of five females participating last year on formerly all-male teams. One of these is the number one diver on the Los Angeles swimming team; the other four were coxswains in the crew program.

C. FINANCING

Analyzing system-wide progress in the funding of women's intercollegiate athletic programs is particularly difficult due to the wide variations in campus programs, budgeting, and funding sources. A detailed budget for each campus, including funding sources and categorized, where possible, by sex, is therefore included in the report from each campus. The reader is referred to Section III for details on financing.

Some general statements on progress are, however, possible and are detailed below. It is important to note, once again, that these statements are subject to the limitations described in Section I--they are only accurate insofar as they describe expenditures which can be identified as benefiting either men or women.

To put the financing picture into perspective, a few notes on funding sources may be helpful. The University's total expenses on intercollegiate athletic programs approximate $6.1 million annually. Of this sum, approximately $1.5 million (or 25%) comes from the University Registration Fee; $4.3 million (69%) from income sources including admissions, television, and radio; $280,000 (4%) from booster and alumni contributions; and 2% from miscellaneous sources. (The portion of revenue derived from these sources varies considerably from campus to campus. See Section III for details.)

Approximately $5.5 million (or 90%) of the total $6.1 million expenditure on intercollegiate athletics can be categorized by sex. That information is presented below. Once again, it must be pointed out that separate administration of men's and women's programs at Los Angeles and Berkeley has enabled us to analyze the total expenditures on those campuses for male and for female athletes. On the remaining campuses, only team support expenses (i.e., supplies, equipment, travel) are identifiable by sex.

Throughout the University, women's intercollegiate athletic budgets were increased 78% between 1972-73 and 1973-74, from a total of $77,878 in identifiable expenditures for women, to $138,824. Over the same period, men's budgets were decreased 2.9%. Financial support of women's intercollegiate programs was increased significantly on most campuses. The increases ranged from a high of $37,500 (or 770%) at Berkeley to a low of $872 (or 16.4%) at Davis. Only Riverside showed actual decreases. NOTE: Decreases on the Riverside campus occur in both men's and

women's budgets and are due primarily to the participation of both the men's and women's basketball teams in expense-laden national tournaments in 1972-73.

Table C

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS BUDGETS

	1972-73	1973-74	Percent Change
Berkeley (total budget)			
Women	$ 5,000	$ 42,500	770% increase
Men	$2,058,000	$2,119,230	2.9% increase
Davis (team support only)			
Women	$ 5,289	$ 6,161	16.4% increase
Men	$ 54,817	$ 57,632	5.1% increase
Irvine (team support only)			
Women	$ 1,015	$ 2,600	156% increase
Men	$ 58,785	$ 72,928	24% increase
Los Angeles (total budget)			
Women	$ 47,701	$ 61,700	29.3% increase
Men	$3,023,538	$2,819,258	6.8% decrease
Riverside (team support only)			
Women	$ 11,074	$ 7,182	35.2% decrease
Men	$ 135,871	$ 96,508	29% decrease
San Diego (team support only)			
Women	$ 2,799	$ 3,681	31.4% increase
Men	$ 20,245	$ 19,696	2.8% decrease
Santa Barbara (team support only)			
Women	$ 5,000	$ 15,000	200% increase
Men	$ 91,736	$ 98,903	7.8% increase

Support per student athlete is another means of identifying trends within intercollegiate budgets. First, a look at the two larger campuses, since their programs are separate by sex and therefore more easily analyzed:

Table D

UNIVERSITY FUNDS*

Berkeley	1972-73	1973-74	Percent Change (support per participant)
Women			
Total Support:	$5,000	$42,500	
Support/Participant:	$40/student	$243/student	500% increase
Men			
Total Support:	$603,000	$468,830	
Support/Participant:	$861.43/ student	$669.76/ student	22% decrease
Los Angeles			
Women			
Total Support:	$ 47,701	$ 61,700	
Support/Participant:	$228/student	$247/student	8% increase
Men			
Total Support:	$140,000**	$275,000**	
Support/Participant:	$203**/ student	$398**/ student	No change. See note below.

*University Registration Fee and ASUC Fees.

**1972-73 University Registration Fee contribution was lowered from normal allocation so department would use up unexpended reserves. Traditional allocation is $275,000, so support/participant in 1972-73 would have been same as 1973-74.

Thus it is clear that, while the student fee contributions to intercollegiate athletics on the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses are not equal for each sex, the gap between allocations per male participant and allocations per female participant is narrowing. The 1970-71 figures for Los Angeles, which show an average of $120 per female participant, reinforce this trend.

When data on income from non-University sources are included in the averages, of course, the results are somewhat different. Budgets for women's programs remain the same as women's sports programs do not produce any income. Total program expenditure per male participant at Los Angeles, however, would approximate $4,376 in 1972-73 and $4,078 in 1973-74. At Berkeley, total program expenditure per male participant would average $2,940 in 1972-73 and $3,027 in 1973-74. The factors which account, in part, for the differences between budgets for men's and women's programs, will be described later.

Intercollegiate programs on the remaining five campuses cannot, as was pointed out earlier, be entirely categorized by sex. For this reason, it is impossible to arrive at comparative University Registration Fee/participant figures for each sex. Instead, those team expenses (i.e., travel, supplies, equipment) which are identifiable as to use by sex are compared by participant below:

Table E

TEAM SUPPORT/PARTICIPANT*

	1972-73	1973-74	% Change
Davis			
Women:	$ 33.69	$ 24.65	27% decrease
Men:	$129.90	$130.76	1% increase
Irvine			
Women:	$ 44.13	$ 86.67	96% increase
Men:	$319.48	$364.64	14% increase
Riverside**			
Women:	$153.81	$ 89.78	42% decrease
Men:	$494.08	$341.02	31% decrease
San Diego			
Women:	$ 39.99	$ 35.06	12% decrease
Men:	$ 37.28	$ 34.25	8% decrease
Santa Barbara			
Women:	$ 40.65	$100.67	14% increase
Men:	$204.77	$177.56	13% decrease

*Excludes administrative, coaching, and grant expenditures. Normally supported by University Registration Fees.

**Larger expenses in 1972-73 due to participation in national tourneys.

There are several factors, aside from simple tradition, which account for differences in the funding of sports for males and females. One of these is the subsidization of student tickets. According to league policy, admission is not charged for women's sports events on any University campuses. On most campuses, however, admission is charged for some male sports events. In order to ensure that students will be able to attend these events free or at reasonable prices, student fees are often allocated for the support of the intercollegiate program. On the Los Angeles campus, for example, the University Registration Fee allocation to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics financially allows that department to admit campus students free to virtually all home football games and to charge only $0.25 per student ticket to home basketball games. An estimated 30,000 students attended home football games in the Fall of 1973, and over 33,000 students attended home basketball games in 1973-74. If students were asked to pay full reserved seat prices for their seats, the price of a season ticket in football in 1973-74 would have been $42.50 and in basketball, $75.00. The $140,000 student fee allocation to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics represented a per capita allocation of $4.73, based on the Los Angeles Fall, 1972 enrollment of 29,641. The 1973-74 allocation of $275,000 represents a per capita allocation of $9.27.

Other reasons for differences in funding levels for men's and women's sports include length of season and number of events entered into. Even in relatively developed women's programs, the lengths of the women's sports seasons are much shorter and the number of women's events much smaller than for comparable men's sports. During the 1972-73 season at UCLA, for example, comparable teams and number of events are as follows:

Table F

COMPARABLE SPORTS -- LOS ANGELES

Women		Men	
Activity	No. of Events	Activity	No. of Events
Softball	4	Baseball	77
Basketball	43	Basketball	45
Cross Country	1	Cross Country	6
Golf	10	Golf	32
Gymnastics	1	Gymnastics	17
Rifle	8	Rifle	10
Swimming	6	Swimming	11
Tennis	28	Tennis	44
Volleyball	35	Volleyball	36
Track	6	Track	12
TOTAL	142	TOTAL	290

Statistics from other campuses, where available, generally reflect this trend. These statistics are particularly important in determining the "team expenses" described earlier. For each event, the cost of travel, officials, meals, advertising, and equipment, must be figured into the team budget.

The local nature of women's competition is also a factor in determining budget support. Since most women's competition takes place in either Northern or Southern California, travel expenses are much less than travel expenses for male teams. Much of the latter's activity takes place out-of-State and necessitates travel by air. It should be noted, however, that this is a circular problem. A major reason for the formation of locally-oriented conferences for women was lack of adequate resources for distant travel. Travel budgets, in turn, have remained low due to the existence of local conferences.

Athletic grants-in-aid also account for a major difference between budgets for men's and women's sports programs. Until this year, women's conferences prohibited grants-in-aid to female athletes. Thus, in the 1972-73 budget, no grants for participants in women's sports were shown. (Several grants were, however, given to female participants on male teams--a practice not forbidden by conference regulations.)

The relatively high cost of certain sports is another factor in determining budget levels for men's and women's intercollegiate athletic programs. Football, for instance, accounts for nearly half of the team expenditures for men's athletic programs on the Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles campuses and thus tends to skew data from these campuses. When football expenditures and participants are removed from these data, the gap between expense per female participant and expense per male participant is reduced considerably. As women, to date, have not expressed a great deal of interest in a full-scale football program, this apparent inequity is more difficult to resolve than most. Some campuses have chosen to deal with the high cost of football by discontinuing (or not initiating) football competition. At other campuses, football is a very popular sport with students, alumni, and community residents, and campus officials are therefore reluctant to discontinue or downgrade their football programs. Also, some campuses rely on football revenues to support sports which do not produce income.

In view of these and other variations among men's and women's programs, it is important to examine funding formulas. Do, for example, male and female athletes have the same meal allowances? When they participate in away-events, are their hotel accommodations comparable? If men fly

to events held some distance away, do women also fly? Is equipment adequate and comparable in quality and age?

As late as one or two years ago, the answer to most of these questions on most University campuses would have been no. Today, however, that situation has changed dramatically. With only a very few exceptions, women generally receive the same meal allowances, merit the same travel arrangements and accommodations, and use comparable equipment, as do the men. The following excerpt from the Davis budgeting memo furnishes a good example:

> "Some budget request items are considered to be 'essential' and, therefore, must be provided to all teams, for example, meals and lodging. We provide the same amount of meal money for each team, according to the meals that will be needed away from the campus. For breakfast, we allow $1.50, lunch $2.00, and dinner $3.50. For lodging we provide $5.00 for each person in the official traveling party.
>
> Since the cost for university vehicles is standard, we provide the funds to all teams to pay for the use of university vehicles for each away contest. The number and type of vehicle is determined by the size of the team. We decide the number of players, trainer, managers, and coaches to make up the official traveling party.
>
> Although the cost of paying game officials differs from sport to sport, we still allocate money to pay for the cost of officials for each contest.
>
> We attempt to purchase all basic equipment for each team. We, hope to provide enough funds so that the equipment inventory will remain adequate for each team. In some instances, for example our women's team, the inventory of equipment is so low that we will allocate extra funds to purchase enough equipment to make the inventory adequate. This will cover the budget so that activity can fluctuate from year to year.
>
> After all of the 'essentials' are provided for, we assign funds, when they are available, for program improvement items. The items may be additional shoes, warm-up uniforms, coaching aids, scoreboards, etc. These are provided after making a survey of all activities to determine which is in need of program improvement items."

In concluding the section on financing, it is important to emphasize the progress that University campuses have made in developing women's intercollegiate athletic programs. Funds for women's programs are being increased each year. Funding formulas are being examined and stripped of any discriminatory aspects. The campuses are trying hard to identify and correct any past inequities. Few would say that the campuses still don't have a long way to go, but fewer still would not credit them with meaningful efforts to develop successful women's programs.

D. STAFFING -- COACHES

Until very recently, coaches for women's intercollegiate teams were predominantly volunteers from the regular Physical Education Department staff. These women ordinarily coached one or two sports per year and received no remuneration for their services. That situation has changed on most campuses and is in the process of changing on others. Now, female coaches generally receive a stipend for their services in coaching a particular sport. Occasionally, they are given a lighter teaching load during the quarter in which their team competes, but they normally make that difference up during the off-season.

Coaches for men's intercollegiate teams fit within three major prototypes: the Physical Education instructor that is released part- or full-time for a quarter to coach the part-time "friend of the University" who coaches one sport for a stipend, and the full-time, paid professional coach. The two largest campuses employ approximately twenty full-time male coaches each. The remainder of their male coaches, and all female coaches, are part-time. Coaches on the smaller campuses almost universally fit within the part-time physical education instructor/coach category.

Salaries for part-time coaches vary from campus to campus. Women's salaries are ordinarily lower than men's, due in part to the shortness of their sports seasons, but progress is being made in narrowing the gap. The San Diego campus, which pays its coaches via stipends, has just recently raised salaries for somen coaches to a level equal to the men.

Coach/participant ratios are nearly identical on most campuses for men and women. Most campuses average between 1:16 and 1:24. On half of the campuses, women have a slightly lower coach/participant ratio; on half, a slightly higher ratio.

E. STAFFING -- ADMINISTRATION

In programs separated by sex (two campuses), the Director of men's Intercollegiate Program is always a male and the Director of the women's Program is always a female. On campuses with combined programs (five campuses), the Athletic Directors are all men. Two campuses, however, have recently appointed female Assistant Athletic Directors (Santa Barbara and Riverside). Others have appointed women as "Coordinators" of women's programs. Those individuals normally participate in all policy-making, budgeting, and scheduling activities.

F. Facilities

Indoor recreational facilities on every campus of the University are totally inadequate to meet student needs. Most were built to handle enrollments one-third to one-half the size of present enrollments. Rapidly increasing student interest in athletic activities--particularly among women--has only served to compound an already serious situation. Several campuses are in the process of correcting space deficiencies by building new recreational facilities. Most, however, have been prevented from doing this by limited budgets.

1. Locker, Shower, and Toilet Facilities

Generally speaking, locker, toilet, and shower facilities on each campus are of comparable size and quality for each sex. Most, in fact, are nearly identical. There are, however, a few exceptions to this rule. At San Diego, for example, women's facilities are much smaller and more intensely cramped than the men's. This is due primarily to delays in building a planned new facility which, when finished, will house the majority of women's facilities. Davis, on the other hand, has the reverse situation. The men's locker room was constructed in 1937 and has not been noticeably improved since that time. The women's locker room was constructed in 1963 and is of much higher quality.

2. Practice and Game Facilities--Quality

Both men's and women's teams on six of the eight general campuses use the same facilities for all competition. Normally, these campuses have one gymnasium and one pool, both of which are scheduled for men's and women's joint usage. Field space and tennis courts ordinarily present no scheduling problems on these campuses, due to their quantity.

On the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, however, men's and women's activities have been historically separated into different facilities. At Berkeley, Hearst Gymnasium was constructed in the mid-twenties primarily for women, and Harmon Gymnasium was constructed for men in the early thirties. Each housed virtually all of the locker and shower facilities for one sex. Each has structural advantages for a certain sport. Harmon Gymnasium, for example, has the only regulation-size basketball court. Hearst Gymnasium has the only adequate lighting for badminton. Due to the separation in their locations, coeducational use of facilities was difficult for fifty years.

The Berkeley campus has attempted to correct this situation during the last two years by adding locker and shower facilities for men to Hearst Gymnasium and for women to Harmon Gymnasium. It is still too early to determine whether these will meet student needs, but the changes have clearly facilitated cross-usage. (See Berkeley report for further details.)

The Los Angeles campus has a similar situation, with both a men's and a women's gymnasium. Each sex normally uses its own gymnasium. The women's gymnasium is considerably smaller than the men's, and the women's pool smaller than that used by the men's swimming team. Pauley Pavillion is used by both sexes, but men's intercollegiate teams generally have first claim to prime time availability. (See Los Angeles report for further details.)

3. Practice and Game Time--Scheduling

On every campus of the University, physical education courses have first priority on the use of all athletic facilities. As interest and participation in these courses increases, the time available for intramural, recreational, and intercollegiate activities decreases. Due to the extremely limited size of indoor facilities, these latter activities were cramped several years ago. Increased participation in athletic activities has, in the absence of new facilities, rendered the situation even more critical now. Every added hour of practice for women's or other new sports requires that existing sports be cut back or moved to unpopular hours.

On the two largest campuses women's teams generally use one facility and men another, thus scheduling of facilities does not present as many problems as on smaller campuses. In certain sports, however, there is only one good facility, and both sexes must compete for use of that facility. While conflicts are often worked out to everyone's satisfaction

(at Berkeley, for example, the men's and women's swimming teams often practice side by side) men's teams do have a higher scheduling priority. Men normally end up with use of joint-use facilities during the 3:00-5:00 pm "prime" practice period and women either practice in non-regulation facilities or practice at a different time. Both campuses are taking a serious look at this traditional scheduling priority this year.

On the remaining six campuses, all athletic facilities are jointly used by men and women. Practice time requests are taken into consideration on an equal basis and the department ordinarily tries to award practice times as close to the requests as possible. In the past, men always got priority when time conflicts arose. This is not true on most campuses now, however, for time is split equally between the sexes in the event of any conflict. The only exception to this general rule appears to be in basketball, where men on most of the campuses receive practice time in the prime 3:00-5:00 pm period.

4. Practice and Game Time--Use

Actual usage of athletic facilities by sex varies, for traditional reasons, in two areas: length of practice and time of games. Women have historically practiced for less time than the men's teams in the same sport. Women's basketball teams, for example, practice by choice for only one and one-half to two hours daily; men's teams almost universally practice three

hours daily. Women's gymnastic teams normally practice two to three hours daily; men's teams three to four. Thus, although the hours of women's practice are increasing, there are still major differences in over-all use due to length of practice.

Also, women's teams have historically scheduled competition on week-days, and men's teams on weekends. While this situation has reduced scheduling difficulties, it may well have an effect on participation and audiences. Mid-week competition also interferes with intramural and recreation programs. Some campuses are encouraging women to schedule events on weekends--sometimes just before the men's events--in order to obtain more audience exposure. These types of changes may take some time, however, for all schools in the conference must agree.

G. Recruitment of Athletes

1. Recruiting Activities

The San Diego and Santa Cruz campuses do not conduct athletic recruiting activities of any kind. Since recruiting activities on the other campuses vary widely in intensity, it is difficult to make generalizations. The reader is therefore referred to the recruiting section in the report from each campus for more detailed information.

Some general statements about recruiting of men and women athletes are, however, possible. On the women's side, until this year women's conference regulations prohibited recruiting of any nature. Thus "recruiting" activities consisted solely of on-campus efforts to interest current students in intercollegiate sports. This year, most campuses have made informal efforts at off-campus recruiting. The emphasis continues, however, to be on the campus.

Male recruiting activities, on the other hand, have traditionally been oriented toward high school seniors and community college transfers. University recruiting activities include mailings, visitations, and visits to the campus.

2. Grants-in-Aid

Three campuses, Davis, Santa Cruz, and San Diego, give no athletic

grants-in-aid. The remaining campuses award varying numbers of grants, each of which is derived according to a specific formula adopted by the NCAA (see Los Angeles report for retails).

The majority of these grants in 1972-73 were awarded to male athletes, since women's conference regulations prohibited financial assistance to participants in conference events. This restriction did not apply to female participants on NCAA teams, however. Thus, campus grants statistics show a few grants to females.

Women's conference regulations have been changed to allow for grants to AIAW participants next year, and several campuses have indicated that they will then proceed to give women's grants. On other campuses, women have expressed strenuous opposition to athletic grants. No decision has yet been made on these campuses about the grants issue.

An approximate breakdown of 1972-73 athletic grants-in-aid by campus follows:

Table G
Athletic Grants-in-Aid

Berkeley	$431,000
Davis	0
Irvine	50,000
Los Angeles	505,057
Riverside	63,000
San Diego	0
Santa Barbara	78,000
Santa Cruz	0

H. Training and Health Services

1. Training Services

Three University campuses (Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara) provide training services to students from both sexes on an equal basis. Three campuses (Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles) provide full-time professional trainers for men, and part-time, paraprofessional trainers for women. Irvine provides a part-time trainer for men and no training services for women (the training room is in the men's locker room). Santa Cruz provides minimal first-aid services for all.

2. Health Services

Student Health Services on each campus provide treatment for injured athletes. These services are open to both men and women on an equal basis.

I. General Problems

Most campuses agree that inadequate facilities are the source of most of the problems in developing women's athletic programs. Several are now in the process of improving their situations by adding new facilities. Without exception, these have been designed with particular attention to the needs of women. Tight budgets have, however, prevented many campuses from building new facilities, so the scheduling crunch is bound to continue. With this realization in mind, campuses are re-examining their scheduling priorities and attempting to identify and eliminate any discriminatory aspects.

Another, and perhaps fundamental obstacle to developing women's programs is an apparent lack of interest on the part of women on some campuses in competitive sports. In several cases, women have simply ignored pleas from intercollegiate program officials--both male and female--to come out for teams. Their hesitation is, of course, understandable in view of traditional male/female roles, lack of athletic training, and unequal skills. It does, however, present a difficult problem for program administrators.

Increased opportunities and athletic training for women at the primary and secondary school level are clearly the answer. But this process is a lengthy one. In the meantime, University campuses are attempting

to build the confidence of women students in their athletic abilities, and to teach them skills. Every year, more women are enrolling in physical education courses. This increase gradually spills over into intramurals and club sports, and, finally, into intercollegiate sports. It will probably take some time until the intercollegiate participation ratio equals the enrollment ratio, but progress is clearly being made.

The final problem in developing women's programs is in funding. Unlike men's programs, women's programs do not produce income. Thus, women's programs must rely totally on University Registration Fees for financial support. Since these Fees have been stretched to the breaking point on every campus, each increased dollar for women has normally been deducted from the men. On some campuses--particularly those with loosely structured programs--this presents no major problems. On others--particularly those involved in large athletic conferences--decreases in men's programming are more serious. Substantial decreases would force these campuses into a non-competitive position within their leagues, thus campus officials are more hesitant to make changes.

INTRAMURALS

A. Policy Governance

Each general campus of the University conducts an intramural sports program for the benefit of its student body. These programs cover a wide range of physical activities and include both individual and team competition. The intramural programs on University of California campuses are highly creative and have strong support from students. For these reasons, University programs are often used as models for new intramural programs on campuses throughout the country.

Student interest is the primary determinant of what sports will be offered in intramural programs. Campus Intramural Directors ordinarily meet with student advisory councils on a regular basis to review programs. These councils include both male and female students. If students, either informally or through advisory councils, express an interest in a certain sport, that sport is generally offered.

B. Current Opportunities

Intramural programs on the various campuses offer competitive opportunities for males, females, and on a coeducational basis. Sex designations have been preserved at student request to ensure that the largest possible number of students have an opportunity to compete at their own skill level. These designations are not enforced by the campuses, however, if students indicate a desire to play on a team designated for the opposite sex. In fact, some campuses encourage this practice.

The primary policy of Intramural Offices with regard to sex distinctions in sports is flexibility. If students from both sexes are interested in a given sport, that sport is usually offered for males, females, and coeducationally. If only females are interested, the sport is offered primarily for women, and vice versa. Again, members of the opposite sex are not precluded from participating under these circumstances. (The only exception is the Los Angeles campus, which prohibits men from playing on women's teams and women from playing on men's teams in four contact sports).

1. Sports Activities

In 1972-73, the combined intramural offerings of the campuses totalled 390. A breakdown of those, by sex, follows:

Women	103 sports activities
Men	180 sports activities
Coed	107 sports activities
TOTAL UC:	390 sports activities

The number of sports offered for each sex on each campus was determined solely by student interest.

2. Participants

In 1972-73, approximately 57,500 students participated in intramural sports activities. (This number includes an undetermined number of duplicates, for the Intramural Offices have no means of determining which students participate in more than one sport.)

Ratios of male to female participants vary widely among the campuses. Women comprise a low of 3.7% of the participants at Irvine and 5.8% at

Riverside. On the Santa Barbara campus, women comprise 37% of the participants; 28% of the Davis participants are women.

Participant figures are detailed for each sex, by campus below. It should be pointed out, once again, that participant figures depend upon student interest. Also, current participation rates for the Fall of 1973 point to significant increases in women participants this year.

Table K
1972-73 Intramural Participants*

Berkeley	
Male	6,500
Female	1,500
Davis	
Male	15,173
Female	5,999
Irvine	
Male	3,318
Female	129
Los Angeles	
Male	7,670
Female	1,955
Riverside	
Male	1,797
Female	111
San Diego	
Male	3,860
Female	1,214
Santa Barbara	
Male	3,920
Female	2,267
Santa Cruz	
Male	1,695
Female	432

*Participant numbers contain an undetermined number of duplicates and may therefore, as in the case of Davis, actually exceed campus enrollment.

C. Financing

The campuses have undertaken serious efforts during the past two to three years to involve more women in intramural sports programs. These efforts are particularly evident in campus intramural sports budgets, for the amount spent per woman participant far exceeds the amount spent per male participant on every campus but one. Irvine and Riverside, for example, have relatively low participation from women in intramural programs. An examination of these campus' budgets, however, reveals that Irvine spends more per female participant than per male participant; Riverside spends nearly five times as much on female participants as on males. Clearly the lack of female participants, then, doesn't stem from a lack of program support. This is true for other campuses as well, although the differences tend to lessen as the participation of women begins to approximate the men's rate. At Los Angeles, for example, a campus with a moderate turnout of women, an average $10 is spent on each female participant and $3 on each male. Participants in coeducational activities average $7 in program costs. Santa Barbara, on the other hand, a campus with high turnout among women, spends $5.23 per female participant and $4.69 per male.

A total of well over $250,000 was spent across the University on Intramural Programs during 1972-73. Identifiable program costs, which do not include administrative and support costs on some campuses, are broken down by campus below:

Table L
Intramural Expenditures

Berkeley	(N/A)
Davis	$82,966
Irvine	$ 4,000*
Los Angeles	$70,841
Riverside	$ 4,422*
San Diego	$10,784*
Santa Barbara	$41,892
Santa Cruz	$ 6,785*

*Direct costs only. Administrative and support services provided through Recreation budget.

D. Staffing -- Officials

All officials for University of California intramural events are registered University students. Each quarter, intramural program administrators advertise for student officials. Emphasis is made on attracting women. All applicants, regardless of sex, undergo training programs.

Program administrators have been disappointed with the turn-out of women to date. All women who have applied have been hired, but relatively few have applied.

Statistics are not available from every campus on the sex of intramural officials. From available figures, however, it appears that approximately 10 to 15% are female.

Generally speaking, the campuses make an effort to have women officiate women's competition; men officiate men's competition; and one official from each sex officiate coed competition. This is not always possible, however, particularly in the latter area.

E. Staffing -- Administrators

On the six smaller campuses, intramural programs are staffed by one Intramural Director. Occasionally this individual (who happens to be a male on each campus) is assisted by one or two part-time students.

On the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, responsibility for the intramural program is divided by sex. Los Angeles has one full-time coordinator each for men's, women's, and coeducational competition.

Berkeley ran totally separate programs last year, women administering the women's program and vice versa. These programs have since been combined under one office.

F. Facilities

Intramural sports competitors use the same facilities described in earlier sections. Outdoor facilities rarely present any problems in intramural scheduling. Indoor facilities are grossly inadequate, however, and cause intramural scheduling on several campuses as late as 1 A.M. The gymnasia are in constant use on every campus until at least 11 P.M.

In order to encourage participation by women in intramural sports activities, women are virtually always given prime times. (Several campuses do this also for safety reasons.) When scheduling conflicts arise, women get priority.

Berkeley ran totally separate programs last year, women administering the women's program and vice versa. These programs have since been combined under one office.

F. Facilities

Intramural sports competitors use the same facilities described in earlier sections. Outdoor facilities rarely present any problems in intramural scheduling. Indoor facilities are grossly inadequate, however, and cause intramural scheduling on several campuses as late as 1 A.M. The gymnasia are in constant use on every campus until at least 11 P.M.

In order to encourage participation by women in intramural sports activities, women are virtually always given prime times. (Several campuses do this also for safety reasons.) When scheduling conflicts arise, women get priority.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES COURSES

A. Policy Governance

Physical education activities courses are offered for unit credit to students on most campuses. These courses, which normally involve 1/2 unit of credit per quarter, are offered through the Physical Education Department. These departments, occasionally called "Ergonomics and Physical Education" or "Kinesiology," are official academic units and conform to regular academic procedures in all of their activities.

For nearly fifty years, the emphasis in physical education activities courses has been on coeducational learning. With the exception of the Berkeley campus, virtually all course offerings are fully coeducational. (The Berkeley campus has separate facilities for men and women, thus coeducational courses are more difficult to organize. See Berkeley Report for details.)

Due to student demand, however, certain classes on each campus have been designated as "predominately" for men or women. Students have expressed a strong preference for certain activities to be segregated by sex, including certain weight-training, weight-reducing, and exercise classes. If students indicate interest, comparable courses are always offered for the opposite sex. The Berkeley campus, for example, just this year introduced a wrestling course for women in response to student interest.

Even within this flexible structure, one-sex designations are never enforced. Only the Santa Barbara campus has indicated that it will enforce student-initiated one-sex designations, but these have never been tested.

B. Current Opportunities

Statistics for the Spring of 1973 have been chosen as a sample of University offerings in the physical education activities area:

Table M
Physical Activities Courses

Berkeley*	
"primarily for men"	116
"primarily for women"	67
Coed	71
TOTAL	254
Davis	
"Male"	12
"Female"	10
Coed	103
TOTAL	125
Irvine	
Male	8
Female	5
Coed	48
TOTAL	61
Los Angeles	
"primarily for men"	4
"primarily for women"	3
Coed	19
TOTAL	26
Riverside	
Coed	84
TOTAL	84

San Diego

"Male"	1
"Female"	2
Coed	61
TOTAL	64

Santa Barbara

"Male"	15
"Female"	6
Coed	185
TOTAL	206

Santa Cruz

"Male"	3
"Female"	3
Coed	94
TOTAL	100

TOTAL UNIVERSITY

Predominantly Male:	159
Predominantly Female:	96
Coed:	665
TOTAL	920 courses

*Berkeley has separate facilities problem.

2. Participants

During the Spring Quarter of 1973, approximately 22,734 students were enrolled in physical education activities courses. Participation by sex varies from campus to campus, with a high of 60% women at Santa Cruz and a low of 29% at Riverside. The system-wide average is 51% female and 49% male. The system-wide undergraduate enrollment of women is 44.9%.

C. Financing

Like all regular academic departments, Physical Education Departments are supported by the State. As virtually all courses (except on the Berkeley campus) are coeducational, a breakdown of funds expended by sex is impossible to complete.

D. Staffing -- Instructors

The staffing pattern varies from campus to campus. Generally, the number of men staff members exceeds the number of women. Following are 1972-73 staffing figures:

Table N
Physical Education Instructors

Berkeley

Male: 10 full-time ladder; 16 part-time temporary
Female: 5 full-time ladder; 4 full-time temporary; 5 part-time temporary

Davis

Male: 18
Female: 4

Irvine

Male: 11
Female: 3

Los Angeles

Male: 3
Female: 2

Riverside

Male: 13
Female: 2

San Diego

Male: 11 full-time; 1 part-time
Female: 1 part-time

Santa Barbara

Male: 18 full-time; 6 part-time
Female: 7 full-time

Santa Cruz

Male: 4 full-time; 2 half-time; 6 contractual; 7 students
Female: 2 full-time; 2 contractual; 4 students

Most campuses have either increased the number of female instructors in 1973-74 or plan an increase in 1974-75. San Diego, for example, added one full-time and six part-time females in 1973. Additions of this sort are particularly difficult during no-growth periods, however.

E. Staffing -- Administration

On the Berkeley campus, the Chairperson of the Physical Education Department is a woman. On the remaining campuses, that position is held by a male. Several campuses have, however, supplemented the Department Chairperson with a "Coordinator of Women's Programs" to advise on women's activities.

F. Facilities

Physical education activities courses are held in the same facilities described in earlier sections. Due to scheduling priority, these classes are less affected by inadequate facilities than other sports programs. As most activities courses are coeducational, there can be no discrimination in scheduling. (See Berkeley Report for details on that campus situation.)

G. Student Services

Until recently, uniform and laundry services provided to Physical Education enrollees on the campuses differed according to sex. Women often did not receive laundry privileges. Currently, however, laundry and uniform services are indentical on six campuses. Both men and women receive comparable clothing issues and may exchange soiled uniforms for clean ones at will. At San Diego, no uniforms are provided. Students must purchase these at the Student Store, but the department launders for both sexes. On the Davis campus, only supporters and socks are issued to men, but these are also laundered. Women receive blouses, shorts, socks, and leotards, but do not have laundry privileges. (These will be added for women in 1974-75, when no-iron clothing is purchased.)

RECREATIONAL CLUB SPORTS

A. POLICY GOVERNANCE

All eight general campuses of the University sponsor a recreational sports club program of some sort. These normally include competitive sports clubs, which are organized primarily for external competition, and recreational or social clubs, which are organized for the primary purpose of providing activities of a common interest.

Sports clubs of both types are initiated and governed solely by students. They normally have an advisor/coach from the campus faculty or staff, but decisions on scheduling, memberships, and policy are made by the students.

B. CURRENT OPPORTUNITIES

The overwhelming majority of University sports clubs are coeducational. Occasionally, however, separate men's and women's clubs are provided in a single sport. In other sports, only one sex has evidenced any interest. The make-up of clubs is always decided by students.

1. CLUBS

The University sponsored approximately 150 sports clubs in 1972-73. With the exception of a few sports on the Irvine and Santa Cruz campuses wherein separate teams were offered for each sex, these clubs were all open to members of both sexes. Table H is a breakdown of the number of clubs offered on each campus.

TABLE H

CLUB SPORTS--1972-73

Berkeley	13
Davis	12
Irvine	24
Los Angeles	41
Riverside	19
San Diego	(included in ICA)
Santa Barbara	19
Santa Cruz	24

2. PARTICIPANTS

Approximately 8,250 people participated in club sports on the various campuses in 1972-73. Of these, 33% were women and 67% were men. The bulk of the participants were students, but some faculty and staff members also participated. Table I is a breakdown of participation by campus.

TABLE I

CLUB SPORT PARTICIPATION--1972-73

	Men	Women
Berkeley	1,000 (59%)	700 (41%)
Davis	348 (65%)	181 (35%)
Irvine	587 (60%)	387 (40%)
Los Angeles	2,200 (73%)	800 (27%)
Riverside	436 (70%)	187 (30%)
San Diego	(included in ICA)	
Santa Barbara	458 (72%)	179 (29%)
Santa Cruz	547 (70%)	233 (30%)

C. FINANCING

Support for Club Sports on the various campuses comes primarily from the University Registration Fee (Santa Barbara and Berkeley, which use Associated Students monies as well, are the only exceptions). Most clubs supplement their University monies with dues or fund-raising activities. Participants also bear a large part of travel costs themselves.

A total of nearly $50,000 was spent on recreational club sports in 1972-73. This amount does not include administrative and recreation program staff costs, which are contained in the section on General Recreation. Table J is an approximate breakdown of direct club expenses by campus. Again, these were primarily from University Registration and Associated Students Fees.

TABLE J

CLUB SPORTS EXPENDITURES -- 1972-73

Berkeley	$ 5,000	(13 clubs)
Davis	16,000	(12)
Irvine	5,000	(24)
Los Angeles	14,000	(41)
Riverside	3,500	(19)
San Diego	(included in ICA)	
Santa Barbara	11,100	(19)
Santa Cruz	9,000	(24)

D. STAFFING--OFFICIALS

Many recreational club activities do not necessitate officiating. Those that do, often use student officials; at other times, professional officials are used. Both types are selected by the teams involved, and include both men and women.

E. STAFFING--ADMINISTRATION

Each club has an advisor or advisor/coach. These are usually male or female faculty and staff members. Recreation department staffs are described in more detail in the General Recreation section for each campus.

F. FACILITIES

Sports clubs use the same facilities as those used by intercollegiate teams. Often, due to competition with physical education classes, intramurals, and intercollegiate activities, sports clubs must practice at odd hours or, occasionally, off campus. Several campuses give scheduling priority to women's clubs in order to encourage the participation of women. Most clubs are fully coeducational, however, so scheduling conflicts are rare.

GENERAL RECREATION

In addition to the organized activities described in the preceding pages, University campuses maintain open or general recreation programs. These normally consist of two components:

1. opening and supervising campus recreational facilities for the use of students, faculty, and staff during certain hours each week;
2. conducting recreational classes for the enjoyment of students, faculty, and staff.

Campus support for the first area includes providing lifeguards for pools, staffing gymnasia, providing activity supervisors, and loaning necessary equipment. These are ordinarily provided through University Registration Fee monies, although the sale of recreation "privilege" cards often supplements the University Registration Fee budget. Well over $1 million is annually spent on recreation at the University.

Facilities open for general use on each campus vary, but often include pools; gymnasia; tennis, squash, and handball courts; picnic areas; and field space. Use of these facilities is unrecorded, and no information is available on the sex of participants.

Recreational classes are normally self-supporting. They include sports-oriented classes, such as scuba, horseback riding, swimming, and sailing; and leisure-oriented classes, such as photography, back-packing, and pottery.

Detailed budgets for recreational activities are provided in detail within each campus report.